G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

File No. 186-12

1912.

Serial Nos. 1-8

(Inward)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1— 8

Part B for Jan. 18

SUBJECT.

Parpathegar's post of Bettada Sri Yoga Narasimha Swamy Temple at Melkote

---

8/8, No. 1748. D. 30.1.18. To. Dy. Commr. Mysore

Records his letter reporting on the Restoration of Tirumaniengar to the

W D 88—GPB—50,000—24-7-16

R. Appadurai
Br. 11.2.18.

G.R.S. 11] 191 2

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(miszai)

NOTES.

File No. 186/12

FILE HEADING.

Parpattegar's post of Bellada Sri yogaraghava swamy temple at melkote

From

Tirumalaiengar of Melkote

No. Petition Dated 9-9-12 Received

Diary No. 473	Enclos. 2	Spare Copies. —	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appeals against the Refusal by Commrs Order directing that Kalamegham Alasingrachar be appointed temporarily for 6 months, to the Parpattegar's post in question

NOTES AND ORDERS.

The petr has produced the following papers:—

i) A Copy of K. Alasingrachar's petition to the Sub Divl office stating that he has temporarily discharged the Parpattegar's duties satisfactorily, that the present Parpattegar holds

NOTES—First Sheet.

GPB—30,000—12-811

Serial No.

2 other appointments, and praying that this appointment may be conferred upon him-

(2) A copy of the Dy Commrs. order Dy 6th July 1912 sanctioning the Sub Divl officer's proposal and calling for further report after the lapse of 6 months

The Aplt says that the Parpattegar post in question is hereditary in his family, & he has necessary documents with him, that he got leave on account of domestic inconvenience having appointed a substitute ~~Pattati~~ as per manual obtaining in the Temple, and that on his return from leave, he applied to the Local authorities to permit him to report himself for duty, but got no reply- He further reports that K. Alasingracher who is ill-disposed towards him in connection with Addika and other cases, having complained to the authorities that the aplt was holding 2 other appointments, the Sub Divl officer's proposal to appoint the respt for 6 months on a tentative measure, subject to confirmation by

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

Serial No

after that time if the duties were discharged well, was sanctioned by the Dy Commr. The petr complains that the respdt is not favorably disposed towards him, that the respdt himself including others hold several appointments at Melkote, that he is holding only the place of Librarian in the Veda Vedanta Bodhini Pathasala temporarily which requires 2 hours work every morning, & that if ordered, he will give up this post. He prays that on a perusal of the records, he may be restored to his post and that pending disposal of his appeal, the Dy. Commrs. order appealed against may be held in abeyance

Submitted for orders

MG (132) 20-9-12

The appeal petn may be forwarded to Dy Com for report

22/11

Submitted with a dft

MG (132) 22-11-12

Issue

25-11-12

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—85,000—17-6-12.

eral and Revenue Secretariat.

Mis File No. 186 of 1912

Serial No.	
2	Do The Dy comr Mysore Dtt No 707 D 29.11.1912 forwards the petn for report— Endt to petr No. 708 D 29 11 1912 From, Srinivasmurgan of Melkote. Petition dy 25-2-13. makes further representations about his case The petr states that he is put to much difficulty being kept out of his post for more than 7 months past, that it will take a long time to get the Dy Commrs. report on the subject and prays that, pending orders of Govt in his case, the Dy Commrs order appealed against may be held in abeyance as originally prayed for by him, He further states that the temple Peshkar who has grown old is in the hands of Narasimha moorthy Rao who is both Head Sumastha of the temple and the Dy Sumastha in charge of temple properties, valuable that Narasimha moorthy Rao's father had been involved in a temple theft case was dismissed and his hak, forfeited but his son managed to get the post

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

1432

Land Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 186 of 1912

Serial No.

and that Narasimha moorthy Nov and Kalamegham Alasingachar (who holds several appointments in the Temple and who is ill-disposed towards the petr in connection with Addika case) have conjointly been doing mischief to him as well as to others

Submitted for orders with draft forwarding AV (13?) 5/3/13. this Petn also for early report

RL
7-3-13

aff'd
RL
12/3/13

4 ~~Remarks~~ To D.C. Mysore.
No 1101 B 14.3.1913
Calling for the report already called for in Petn

5 From, the Dy Commr, Mysore Dist
Letter no. 418 Dy 17/26 March 1913.
Submits report on the appeal petition of Srimanmiengar of melkote.

On 23d June 1911, Srimanmiengar of melkote submitted a leave memo to the Temple authorities applying for a months leave from the 24th idem and adding that during his absence, manegar Krishna Iyengar would attend to Parpatya duties and Paricharak Shamanna, Stanik duties

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

in the Sri Narasimhaswamy temple at Melkote. On 24th June, the temple Peshkar made his recommendation and the then Dy Amildar Mr. Narasimhachar sanctioned the leave on substitute. Under date 18th July 1911, Tirumana Iyengar sent in an application from Srirangam applying for 3 months' extension of leave on the same substitutes to enable him to ~~study~~ complete the study of certain ~~Sanskrit~~ works. On 21st July, the temple Peshkar submitted the application to the Dy Amildar for sanction of leave, and it does not seem that any orders were passed by the Dy Amildar. Under date 18th Octr 1911, he again applied from Srirangam for one month's extension. The Peshkar made his usual recommendation but no orders were passed by the Dy Amildar. On 22d Novr 1911, he applied for 3 months' extension on the same substitutes, as he had to perform the obsequies of a deceased Archak of Jeer Samudki. On 23d idem, the Peshkar recommended leave to the applicant. On 29th idem, the Dy Amildar enquired whether Tirumanicengar was the barawarddar Stanik, to which the Peshkar replied that the barawand was in the joint names of Tirumanicengar's brother.

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

Serial No.

Narasimhachar and his sister-in-law. The Dy Amildar enquired under whose authority Tirumamiengar was attending to the Stanik duties in the temple. The Peshkar submitted his explⁿ dated 1st Feby 1912 together with an application for another 6 months extn of leave Tirumamengar says that Stanik and Parpatya posts are hereditary in his family and the brothers are hissedars, that the question of one man doing both the duties had come up previously and the then Dy Amr after a perusal of his Daklas etc, ~~was of opinion~~ raised no objection to it and that from Decr 1903, he was attending to Stanik duties - He added that under an order of Inuzrai officer of 1869, their work will have to be taken by their substitutes during their absence As desired by the Dy Amildar, A a copy of the Hukum* Dy 11-2-1869 which was obtained from the apltt (Tirumamiengar was submtd to him by the Peshkar This Hukum says that orders had been separately issued about the work being taken during the absence of the servants of Bettada Narasimha Swamy temple, by the substitutes appointed by

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

Serial No.

the absentees, and the same procedure was applicable in the case of the petr Stanik yoga Narasimhachar of the temple On 25th April 1912, the Dy. Asst observed that the order produced was passed some 40 years ago and enquired whether servants of this temple were not obtaining leave formally whether they were appointing substitutes on their own responsibility and whether there was any objection to direct the aplt to refund the pay he had received in case yoga Narasimhachar did not get leave according to Codal rules after the Stanik varavard was made out in his name and if the Parpatteyar was doing Stanik duties on his own responsibility and receiving the pay The Peshkar replied on 22nd May that according to a Tg order of 2 dgue 1908, one man was attending to both Stanik and Parpatya duties, that leave was sanctd after approval of the Bodlis appointed by the petr, and that no reps could be traced whereby the temple servants were appointing substitutes independently, and availing themselves of the leave-

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 186 of 1912

Serial No.

On 20th April 1912, Kalameegham Mannagaden petd the Sub Divl officer and the Dy Commr stating that it had been decided in 1895, that during the absence of the Parpattegar of Beltada temple, he had to attend to the duties, that he had on several occasions temporarily discharged the Parpattegar duties satisfactorily, that the appointment in question was not hereditary, that the present Parpattegar held 2 other posts One on Rs 7/- in the Sanskrit Pathsala and the other on Rs 5/- in the library and prayed that on a perusal of the records, the posts might be given to him the Sub Divl Officer refd the petition on 2-5-1912 to the Dy Office for report - On 14th may, the Dy Commr refd the petr to the L. authorities

On 18th June 1912, the Dy. Asst said that the Parpattegar held 2 other posts which required work both in the morning and evening, that there was no use in sanctioning leave to him, that some correspondence was going on about the Manegar not doing duties satisfactorily and that it was desirable that

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

Serial No.

a permanent hand be appointed to the post He directed that a competent man be chosen for this post and that Stanik post might be given to one who knew Sama Veda. The Peshkar reported that the Parpathegari was a responsible post, that for the time being, if K Alasingachar who was attending to Kalyani Pradakshina Post be appointed to it, the work could be got through satisfactorily, and that there were refs to show that Alasingachar had previously attended to this work and promised to make a separate reference about Stanik post.

On 24th June 1912, the Dy. Asst. reported to the Sub Divl officer that Tirumamiengar had other duties to attend to and could not devote his full time to Parpatiya and Stanik duties in the temple, that the Parpatiya post was not hereditary, that Manigar Krishniengar (Badli appointed by Tirumala Iyengar) committed irregularities in his work, that one months leave on account of Plague was sanctd to Tirumamiengar in June 1911 and since

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

Serial No.

then he had been on leave He solicited orders in the matter of appointing K. Alasingrachari recommended by the Temple Peshkar, to the Parpathiya post in question and added that Alasingrachari was an experienced hand who had satisfactorily discharged the duties of this office and who held credentials from the previous Peshkar as regards his good work The Sub Divl officer proposed the appointment of Alasingrachari as Parpathiyan tentatively for 6 months, And on 6th July 1912, the Dy Commr sanctioned the proposal and called for a further report after 6 months.

On 19th July 1912, Tirunarmenguan applied to the Dy office praying for permission to report himself for duty and adding that he had set right his domestic affairs and had recouped his health. The Dy Asst referred the matter to the Peshkar and the latter said that a Badli had been appointed by Govt and that it was not desirable to disturb him. The Dy Asst observed that the pltf could not be allowed to do duties in two different Depts and places

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 186 of 1912

Serial No.

Sirumamiengar appealed to the Dy Cmnr praying for his restoration to the Parpatya post which was hereditary in his family He represented to the Dy. Cmnr that he had given up Librarian and other duties The matter was refd to the Sub Divl Offr who called for a detailed report from the Amildar. The Dy. Amr enquired of the Peshkar about K. Alasingachar's work in the temple and the Peshkar reported that Alasingachar was working satisfactorily in the temple, ~~those~~ that the income of the temple improved and that the devotees had no difficulty either in visiting the deity or in getting their Seva conducted.

The Dy Amr reported that ~~they~~ there were ~~four~~ orders to say that Parpatya was not a hereditary post, that Sirumamiengar merely said that he would give up his other appointments but did not give a statement to that effect when called upon by the Peshkar, that the ~~pers~~ held appointments in the Library and Sanskrit Pathasala and other places could not be expected to do full justice to Parpatya ~~the~~ post, the responsible

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

Serial No.

duties of which required a whole-time official; that Tirumamicegar had connection with petition-writers at Melkote and during his Parpatya, the devotees had complaints against him, that K. Alasingrachar could conveniently attend to Vicharane duties etc with Parpatya post as the former required mere supervising that the Peshkar reported that K. Alasingrachar was doing good work, that there is hamul by which the Adhyaksha of the Sanskrit Pathasala and Lakshmi Nrsachar held posts in the Temple out of "Manigade" but the same did not apply in the case of Parpatya duties

The Sub Divl officer Mr V Rama Rao observed as follows:—

"Tirumamicegar has too many offices and is unfitted by his past from being Parpathegar- Parpathegari is not a hakdari or hereditary appointment It requires a whole time man. I am for confirming Alasingrachar.

Tirumamicegar has appealed to Government the main grounds for appeal are as follow:—

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

Serial No.

1) that the Parpatya post is hereditary in his family and he has documents in support of his statement

2) that K. Narasingrachar is ill-disposed towards him in connection with Adika & other posts, and holds several appointments at Melkote

(Jud. 7. no. 631-09 and 706-11 put up)

3) that he is holding only the temporary place Librarian in the Veda Vedanta Bodhini Pathasala which requires work for 2 hours every morning and if ordered, he will give up this post.

In his petition addressed to the Councillor, Srinivasiengar says that on account of domestic inconvenience, he had to take leave and so to a distant place & that he had to apply for extensions, but no orders were issued to him as to whether his leave was sanctioned or not, and that after his return, when he prayed for permission to rejoin his duty no orders were issued to him. He complains that his opponent K. Narasingrachar holds 4 posts at Melkote as summarized in his petition. He has produced a letter from the Adhyaksha of the Sanskrit

NOTE.--Contn sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

S. 121

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 186 of 1912

Serial No.

Pathasala stating that he holds temporarily the post of Librarian in the Pathasala and says that if directed, he will give up this post. He repeats that the post in question is hereditary in his family, and adds that no opportunity was given to him to represent his case

Submitted for orders

PV (134) 13.5.13. It is not clear what documents Tirunarayanayyan has in his possession to show that the offices are hereditary in his family. These are not in the records. The Inspector of Pathasalas says that the offices are not hereditary ones.

If Tirunarayanayyan had once held these offices he agrees to give up the temporary office he now holds. It is not clear why he should not be given his former offices & why the substitutes should be confirmed while the permanent incumbent is willing to discharge the duties there of.

This seems to be a matter to be disposed of after a personal hearing of the party or parties

Subt for orders

BL 16-5-13

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

General and Revenue Secretariat. File No. 186 of 1912

Serial No.

The present appeal originated and is connected with the temporary appointment of K. Alagiya Mudali as Karpathy during the absence on leave of Barnabas and without his consent. The essential point for decision in that case is whether or not the Mudaliarship as claimed by the appellant

In the meantime and during the pendency of the above appeal, the Karavahar Tisawa Amunugama himself appointed to act in his duties but permission was not so granted. Upon this an appeal was prepared from the D.C. Court wherein Tisawa has claimed a Mudali right to the office. The reports of the Mudali and Subadis officers have been received in the matter but the D.C. Court has still to pass his final order on this question. As this subject is really the major question on a decision of which the former appeal rights would follow, the papers may be returned to the D.C. Court for his decision on the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

ral and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. | of 1912

Serial No.

on this proceed
Put up a brief draft
for approval

Hg
25 6 13

Submitted with a draft letter to the Hon. Councillor

AV (132)
27-6-13

Hg
27 6 13

Approved
30/6/13

Hg
2/7

Hg
2/7

To
The Dy. Commr. Mysore
No 43 & S. 7.9.13

Requesting him to decide whether the office in question is hereditary & then submit the records for the orders of Govt.

From the Dy. Commr, Mysore Dis
Letter No 212 Dy 14.6.1914.

Submits finding that (illegible)
for in Serial 6

The Dy. Commrs. report explains the facts of the case.

Mr B. C. Krishna Shastry, Sub Dist

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G I P—65,000—17-7-12.

WD 1233—GPB—60 000—1 12-16—S

Serial No.

officer of French Rocks has conducted an elaborate enquiry and after an examination of the contending parties and the documents relied upon in the case, has decided that the Bettada Parpatya in question is hereditary in the family of the Apth Tirunarayanaya and that the latter is entitled to re-enter on his duties as Parpathegar on condition that he will attend solely to these duties as undertaken by him—

May the case be posted for hearing with the next batch of cases, notices being issued both to the apth Tirunarayanayya and the respt Kalamegham Aladiyarachar?

Submitted for orders

AV(GA) 19.7.17 19/7/17 1) Whether the post is a hakdari one or not has been decided by the Asst Govt and the matter is under appeal before the Dy Com the papers will have to be returned as requested

2) the exclusion of appellant from dealing on his duties after leave - applied for but not granted as often as asked — without prescribing the period of such —

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD 1283—GPB—60 000—1 12-16—S

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 186 of 1912

Serial No.

exclusion so very unfair the consideration that (i) the man has too many duties performs (ii) that his conduct was unsatisfactory and (iii) that he should work while time should have been considered when he was on duty and not when he was on leave, his substitute working against him the while. He will have to be given the office which he held and if the local Officers think fit, they may prescribe rules for his working satisfactorily. — Ramaprada the substitute — has no locus standi so far as the appeal before Govt is concerned.

M.D. 20/7/17

As Tirumaraneiyar has been removed from the Mayavaram office and is apparently doing his work satisfactorily there is no case for Govt to decide now. Record the DJ court's report and return the file. Remove the case from the list of pending cases. The DJ court will dispose of the appeal of Ramaprada-char who has no locus standi.

Ld 10.1.18

KB 15/1/18

Submitted. Issue a Govt. order for appl

AV (CJ) 23-1-1918

23/1/18

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

2015

120

General and Revenue Secretariat. MH. File No. 186 of 1912

Serial No.

Draft may be approved

Secy) MS 24/1/16.

appd

MS. 25/1/16. 25-1-16

No 170 1748 of 30-1-16 To D.C Mysore

Records the above

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G11—65,000—17-(-12.

No 707 Enc 2 Dy 29.11

186—12—2

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.....

The accompanying Petition Registered No. 473 dated 9.9.12 received at the General and Revenue Secretariat from Srinivasaiengar of Melkote appealing against the Dy. Comm's order directing that Kalameegham be appointed temporarily to the Parpatheyar's post of Bellada Sri yoga narasimhaswamy temple at Melkote,

(Stet)

is forwarded, together with its enclosures, (2)

to the Dy. Commr. Mysore Dist.

.....for report

By Order

DSA 25.11.12

For Secretary

BANGALORE,

.....191

P. T. O.

cofd 26/11/12

GPB—1,000 1-21

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್.....

.....

.....

.....ಗೆ

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ ಹೂಕುಂ.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

ವಿಧಿಸಲಾಗಿರುವ ಶುಲ್ಕವು ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿಕ್ಕೊಂಡ..... 473 ರೂ. ಕಂಡಾಲು

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು.....

.....

.....ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

By Order,

Secretary.

18/3/13

G.R.S. 29A]

19

From

Secy. to the Govt. of His Highness
The Maharaja of Mysore,
Genl. and Rev. Dept.

To

The Dy. Commr,
Mysore Dist.

Dated

Despatched 14. 3. 1913

Received

General No. 1101

Mun No. 186-12

Enclosure No.

In contn of this office
memo. no 407
Mun. 186-12-2 dy 29th
Nov. 1912 calling for a
report on the petition of
Jiyunarasingar of Melkote
appealing against the Dy
Commrs. order regarding the
Parpathegar's post of Kottada
Nara Simhaswamy Temple at
Melkote, has the honor
to forward herewith petition

no. 1432 fr.

Tirunarnicngar on the same
subject, and to request that
the subs of the Report
already called for on the
subject may be expedited

By order,

13/3/13
for Secretary

DBT

RL
7-3-13

VIII
2-8-3 D

From The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

DIARY No 1637
10/219/13
SECTION 9002
NO. 186-12
5

To The Secretary to Govt
Revenue Branch

Dated 17-3-13.

Despatched 26-3-13.

Received

General No. 418.
No.

Enclosure No. files

Submits report on the petition of Srinivasa a Sycegaon of Melkote re. parapathegani post of Sri Yoga Narasimha Swamy temple at the place

No. 418
Files

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District
Dated, Mysore 17th March 26

K Chandy Esqr., B A

K R. Srinivasa Iyengar Esqr., M.A.
Office

With reference to your official memorandum No. 707/Misc. 18-12-2 of the 29th November 1912, and subsequent docket No: 1101/Misc. 186-12 of the 14th instant, calling for the submission of a report on the petition of Srinivasa Iyengar Iyengar of Melkote appealing against this office order regarding the Parupatyagar, part of the Sri Yoga Narasimha Swami

Temple, at Wellawatte

che, I have the honour to state

as follows :—

The Deputy Surveyor of

French-Rocks reported, in his

Bill No. 204 of the 24th June 1912

that the petitioner Sinnaramien

barawarden parapattegar of

the Temple, applied for leave

of one month from 24-6-1911

and that it was sometime

that owen since he was

appointed for the post in 1903

he was been on leave for

more than 4 years ~~that his~~

~~several~~, that his several

applications for other leave

of

of leave he applied
June 1911 had not been
sanctioned, that he holds
the appointments of Librarian
in the Temple Library and
that of a Teacher in the
Sanskrit Pathasala, which
occupies his whole time
that as he has also got
these other appointments
he cannot devote his full
attention to the responsible
duty of a Parapatteger, that
his Guru the Krishnamegar
for the Parapatteger's duty
proved himself unworthy

of

as he tampered with some accounts and recommended the appointment of one Kalaneghan Alaringswami who had on some previous occasions acted as prapattigar and shown his Capacity in the discharge of his duties on probation for sometime

Mr. L. Krishna Rao the division officer, French Rocks upheld the views of the Deputy Amildar and submitted the papers for orders, whereupon my predecessor Krishnaiyer

Attested

Sanctioned the proposal
with the observation that
a report should be submitted
after six months

It is against the above
order that Tirumaraiengar
has now appealed.

The 3 files of papers
touching upon the unfitness
of the said Tirumarayana Iyyar
to the responsible post of
Parapattegar of the temple
in question in particular
are herewith submitted
for perusal.

The petitioner relies
with

with the official memorandum

and docket under reply

are herewith resubmitted)

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

K. Mundy

Deputy Commissioner

The Private Secretary

File No. 186/12

Serial No. 6

Diary No. of letter replied to 1637

No. 43 Emoluments

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* 191

Date of issue 5th July 1913

Signed by W. Ramanujam Iyengar

To

The Dy. Commr,

Mysore Divn,

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No. 418 Dy 17th March 1913 reporting on the petition of Tirumaniengar of Melkote appealing against the order of the Dy. Commr approving of the appointment of one K. Alasingrachar to officiate as Parpathegar of Sri Yoga Narasimhaswamy Temple

over.

SUBJECT.

(33)

at Melkote during the absence on leave of the apltr., I am directed to observe that the aplt who is the permanent baramanddar for the post appears to have subsequently sought permission to rejoin his duties and this the Dy. Asstr of Dr. Roads Sub-Talukdar declined to grant. He appears to have preferred an appeal on 29th July 1912 to the then Dy. Commr against this order and prayed for the office being restored to him and he has further alleged among other things that the office in question is hereditary in his family. His appeal is still pending the decision of the Dy. Commr. As this is evidently the main ~~question~~ issue relating to the ~~matter~~ subject I am to request that you will be

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

GPB—25,000—8 8 11

G R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

So good as to decide this matter ~~appeal~~ also its merits and then submit the records for the orders of Govt as early as practicable.

2) The entire records together with the petitions on the subject received in this office, are herewith returned.

I have etc.

30/6/13

30/6

27.6.13

for Secretary

27.6.13

B—50,000—30-7-16

1916-17.

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

19 -19

SECTION

FILE N 106-12

SERIA

To The Secretary
to the Government of H. H. the
Maharaja of Mysore, General
department, Huzur
14th June 1917 Bangalore
14½ June 1917.

General No. D. 3 2 2.

No.

Enclosure No.

Submits a report re
the office of Parpathegar
of Sri Yoganarasimha
Swamy temple at Melkote
Irruch Roads Sub Tha

Office of the

Mysore

Dated 14th June 1917.

From.

K. Matthan Esquire B.A.

Deputy Commissioner

Mysore District.

To.

D. Ry. Narasingarao Esquire B.A. B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of

H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore

General department, Mysore Branch

Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No: 43 Mysr 186-12-6 dated 5th July 916 and subsequent reminders re the office of Parpathegar of Sri Yoganarasimhaswamy temple at Melkote, I have the honor to state as follows:

A petition, dated 29th July 1912, from one Sirumarayana Iyengar of Melkote, appealing against the order of the then deputy Amildar of French Rocks, declining to grant permission to the petitioner to rejoin his duties, was received in this office and forwarded to the Sub division officer, French Rocks, for report with records.

In this connection another petition from the said Sirumarana Iyengar appealing against the deputy Commissioner's order appointing one Alasingachar temporarily as parpathegar of the temple in question, was received in this office with your Memorandum No: 707 Mysr 186-12-2 dated 29th November 1912 for report and the entire file of records was submitted

with this office letter No: 418 dated 17/26 March 1918. On receipt of the records back in this office with the reply, my predecessor, Mr: A. Subramanya Iyer, seems to have heard the appeal on 1st August 1913, but reserved final orders. When the matter was brought to my notice on the 20th July 1916, I referred the appeal case in question to the Sub division officer, French Rocks, to whom I have delegated certain magisterial powers.

The Sub division officer French Rocks, (Vide his report No: 213 dated 3rd May 1917) decided that the appellant (Thirumarayana Iyengar) being Haldar, was entitled to recede on his duties as Parpathegar on condition that he would attend solely to these duties as undertaken by him.

The Sub division officer's order on the subject together with the entire file of records is enclosed for reference. As, in this case, the present officiating Parpathegar has preferred an appeal to me against the Sub-division officer's order, and as this appeal has to be disposed of, I request you to kindly return the connected records early after use.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient Servant

Deputy Commissioner

& Magistrate

S. VI-71]

SUBJECT..... L Records the Dy. Comm's letter reporting on the restoration of Srirangacharyar & re Parupatya of Bettada Narasimha Swamy. mpl c

Diary No. of *eplied to*.....2015
Fn. D. 186/12

Section
File No.
Serial No.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

, *the* 191

Date of issue ....

Signed by.....

Read.—

Petition regd. no 473 Dy 9th Sept 1912 from Srirangacharyar of Melkote appealing against the order no 11 Dy 6th July 1912 of the Dy. Comm^r, Mysore District, directing the temporary appointment of Kalamegham Hathigrama ~~Order Thereon.— No.~~ to Parapattegar's post of Bettada Sri yoga Narasimha Swami Temple at Melkote

Correspondence

May this be

i Printed?

ii treated as a standing order?

iii published in the Gazette English part?

iv translated?

v placed at the disposal of the press?

vi published in the Gazette Kannada part?

with Letter no. 212 dy 14th June 1917 from the Dy. Commr, Mysore Distt, reporting that on an examination of the contending parties and the documents relied upon in the case, the Sub Divl Officer of Fr. Rocks decided that the appellant is entitled to re-enter on his duties as Pampathegar, and that Thimmaniengar has since been restored to the office on condition that he will attend solely to these duties as undertaken by him under thereon — No.

List of enclosures.

Recorded

Dr
21.1.18

Joint Secretary

Copied by

Examined by

Dr
14/1/18 ann Insp Dept 11 23/1/18

Dr,
the Dy. Commr Mysore